

UNCLASSIFIED

Attachment to Guidance #61

From

Report of the Officials
of the
Government of India
and the
Peoples Republic of China
on the
Boundary Question

Given to the Indian Parliament on 14 February 1961

In the preceding pages it has been shown that traditional boundaries are delimited by a historical process and that both Indian and Chinese evidence established beyond doubt that the true traditional boundary between the two countries is that shown by India. The Chinese side, by the logic of their own arguments, should recognise that traditional boundaries are valid and that the emphasis on formal delimitation is irrelevant and extraneous to the Sino-Indian boundary dispute. Any kind of formal delimitation is optional and not essential in establishing the location and validity of traditional boundaries. If boundaries only become valid when they are formalized in a Boundary Agreement, it would amount to suggesting that there were no valid boundaries between China and Nepal or Burma prior to 1960, and that there are still no boundaries between China and Mongolia and, in the Sarikol sector, between China and the U.S.S.R.--indeed that there were no boundaries in the world before such formal agreements, which are a feature only of modern history.

The fact is that formal delimitation of the Sino-India boundary cannot resolve the issue because, unlike the northern boundaries of Nepal or Burma, the Indian and Chinese alignments are separated for long distances by large belts of territory--100 to 150 miles in depth. The crux of the Sino-Indian boundary question is not the nature of the boundary, because both sides contend that their alignment is, in fact, what for centuries has been accepted, but which of the two alignments is the true traditional boundary. During the last six months the two sides brought forward material which they considered to be in support of the stands of their respective Governments. The Indian case stood proven, as it conformed to the obvious principles of the formation of traditional boundaries, and was, therefore, naturally and irresistibly supported by unbroken historical evidence and administrative record. The Chinese case, on the other hand, was found to be inconsistent in logic, and documentary support for it was meagre and lacking in content. The result as is plain from these Reports, was a telling contrast between the wealth of consistent and conclusive evidence produced by the Indian side, and the sketchy and contradictory material brought forward by the Chinese side. The positive Indian evidence as well as the analysis of the Chinese evidence establish indisputably that the true traditional boundary between India and China is that defined in the description provided by the Indian side at the commencement of these discussions. The title of India is an ancient and immemorial one, and no major dispute regarding it existed till just over twelve months ago. The majestic arc of the Kuen Lun and the Great Himalayan Ranges forms the most impressive natural boundary in the world, has been recognized in tradition and custom for centuries, has determined the limits of administration on both sides and has received conformation, for different sectors at different times during the last 300 years, in valid international agreements. The facts, therefore demand respect for this boundary defined by nature, confirmed by history and sanctified by the laws of nations.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Attachment to Item #360

Extracts from "Peking's Drive for Empire"-
The New Expansionism by Robert C. North
published in Problems of Communism (Jan-Feb 1960)

Disintegration of the Empire

CPYRGHT

⁸ Ibid., p.192

UNCLASSIFIED

(MORE)

